

REMARKS

Claims 99 and 101-118 are pending in this application. Claims 99, 101, 102, and 113-115 are amended. Claims 100 and 119-138 are canceled. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

The Double Patenting rejection of claims 119-138 on page 10 of the Office Action is moot because claims 119-138 have been canceled from the present application.

On pages 2-10, the Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. § 102 claims 99-138 as being anticipated by Cowart, *Mastering Windows 3.1* (hereafter "Cowart"). The § 102 rejection of claims 119-138 is rendered moot by their cancellation. Applicants submit that the pending claims 99 and 101-118 are in condition for allowance over the applied art for at least the following reasons.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 Fed. Cir. 1987).

Cowart does not anticipate the claims because Cowart does not disclose or suggest all of the claimed features. For example, Cowart does not disclose or suggest a method for arranging a desired number of activated windows of information for display on a screen connected to a computer which includes "choosing the desired number of activated windows to arrange on the screen in the particular format," as claimed in independent claim 99. This feature has been incorporated from dependent claim 100 (now canceled). The Office Action at page 3 states that Cowart teaches this feature at page 66 and page 67, Figs. 2.8 and 2.9. However, on page 67, cited by the Office Action, Cowart shows that windows can be displayed in a "Cascade" format (Fig. 2.8) or a "Tile" format (Fig. 2.9). However, the cited sections of Cowart do not disclose or suggest choosing the desired number of activated windows to arrange on the screen in the particular format, as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 99 is patentable over Cowart for at least this reason.

Additionally, Cowart does not disclose or suggest "identifying activated windows for display, wherein the number of activated windows identified for display equals the desired number of activated windows to be displayed in the particular format" (emphasis added), as claimed in independent claim 99. Therefore, independent claim 99 is patentable over Cowart for these additional reasons.

Claims 101-105 depend from independent claim 99. Therefore, dependent claims 101-105 are patentable over Cowart for at least the reasons stated above and for the additional features recited therein. For example, Cowart does not disclose or suggest "choosing the desired number of activated windows to arrange on the screen comprises choosing a default value," as recited in dependent claim 101. The Office Action at page 3 states "[a] default value is defined as a value that the system uses when the user does not specify a value." Applicants submit that the sections of Cowart cited in the Office Action (i.e., page 67, Figs. 2.8 and 2.9) do not disclose or suggest anything about a "default value," either selected by the system or the user. As described above, Cowart, at page 67, shows that windows can be displayed in a "Cascade" format (Fig. 2.8) or a "Tile" format (Fig. 2.9). However, nothing on page 67 discloses or suggests "choosing the desired number of activated windows to arrange on the screen comprises choosing a default value," as in dependent claim 101. Therefore, dependent claim 101 is patentable over Cowart for these additional reasons.

With respect to dependent claim 102, the sections of Cowart (i.e., page 67, Figs. 2.8 and 2.9) cited in the Office Action, at page 4, do not disclose or suggest "recognizing one or more activated windows which have not been identified for display and will not be arranged for display on the screen in the particular format," as claimed. On page 4, the Office Action states that "[t]he row of icons on the bottom of each figure represent identified windows that are not arranged for display." However, the row of icons shown at the bottom of Figs. 2.8 and 2.9 are un-launched application programs. These icons are not activated windows which have not been identified for display, as claimed. Cowart does not disclose or suggest these features of dependent claim 102. Therefore, dependent claim 102 is patentable over Cowart for these additional reasons.

The Office Action cites the same Figs. 2.8 and 2.9 of Cowart as disclosing "wherein an activated window not identified for display may be represented on the screen with a representative display," as recited in dependent claim 103, and "the representative display is an icon which graphically represents the recognized window and wherein the icon is displayed simultaneously with an identified window," as recited in dependent claim 104. However, as stated above, the icons shown in Figs. 2.8 and 2.9 are un-launched application programs, and are not activated windows. Therefore, dependent claims 103 and 104 are patentable over Cowart for these additional reasons.

With respect to independent claim 106, Cowart, at page 67, as cited in the Office Action, does not disclose or suggest "generating a display on the screen for viewing identified windows and recognized windows, wherein a first format display is generated for each of the identified

windows, wherein a second format display is generated for each of the recognized windows" (emphasis added), as claimed. As described above, Figs. 2.8 and 2.9 of Cowart disclose that windows can be displayed in a "Cascade" (Fig. 2.8) or "Tile" format (Fig. 2.9). However, Cowart does not disclose or suggest generating a display having a first format display for each identified active window and a second format display for each recognized active window, as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 106 is patentable over Cowart for at least these reasons.

Claims 107-112 depend from independent claim 106. Therefore, dependent claims 107-112 are patentable over Cowart for at least the reasons stated above and for the additional features recited therein. For example, Cowart does not disclose or suggest "the second format is graphic icons and the graphic icons are arranged to overlay on the first format display" (emphasis added), as in dependent claim 108. Figs. 2.8 and 2.9 of Cowart, cited by the Office Action to disclose these features, do not disclose or suggest that the second format graphic icons are arranged to overlay on the first format display. Therefore, dependent claim 108 is patentable over Cowart for these additional reasons.

With respect dependent claim 111, Cowart's Figs. 2.8 and 2.9 do not disclose or suggest "the generating step further comprises minimizing the recognized windows" (emphasis added) as claimed. Therefore, dependent claim 111 is patentable over Cowart for these additional reasons.

Independent claim 113 recites "means for auto-arranging windows of information into an arranged format ... wherein each time a previously inactivate window is activated, all the active windows are arranged ... and wherein the previously inactive window is displayed in a second format" (emphasis added). Cowart, in the sections cited in the Office Action (i.e., page 66-67, Figs. 2.8 and 2.9), does not disclose or suggest these features. Therefore, independent claim 113 is patentable over Cowart for at least these reasons.

Claims 114-118 depend from independent claim 113. Therefore, dependent claims 114 and 118 are patentable over Cowart for at least the reasons stated above and for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that all of the objections and rejections against this application have been fully addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, withdrawal of the outstanding

objections and rejections and a notice of allowance for the application are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Customer No.: 038598
ANDREWS KURTH LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1350 I Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone No.: (202) 662-2700
Facsimile No.: (202) 662-2739

Respectfully submitted,



Aldo Noto
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 35,628

Date: **May 11, 2007**